

REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims

In the present Amendment, independent Claims 1, 18, 19 and 20 have each been amended to incorporate the subject matter of each of Claims 2, 3, 8 and 10. Claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 16. Accordingly, Claims 2, 3, 8, 10 and 16 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 18 and 20 were also amended for purposes of clarification.

No new matter has been added, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested. After entry of the Amendment, Claims 1, 11, 13-15 and 17-20 will be pending.

Response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Referring to paragraph no. 3 at pages 2-3 of the Office Action, Claims 1 and 3-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,558,605 (“Wilson”) taken together with either U.S. Patent No. 6,096,088 (“Yu”) or U.S. Patent No. 6,816,820 (“Friedl”).

Without conceding to the merits of the rejection, independent Claims 1, 18, 19 and 20 have been amended herein to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 2, which was not subject to the present rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1 and 3-20 based on Wilson, Yu and Friedl.

(b) Referring to paragraph no. 6 at page 3 of the Office Action, Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wilson taken together with either Yu or Friedl and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,454,973 (“Norton”).

Applicants traverse and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

The independent claims presently recite that a production parameter is optimized under a condition that at least one of the valve gates is opened at any spot during a filling state, wherein the production parameter is a parameter to control the action of valve gates positioned in a plurality of resin inflow conduits.

In contrast, Wilson, Yu, Friedl and Norton, alone or in combination, do not disclose or fairly suggest this feature of the present claimed invention. Even if the references did disclose this feature of the present claimed invention (which they do not), the Examiner has failed to articulate an adequate rationale for combining the prior art to attain the claimed invention. Thus, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of Claim 2 based on the disclosures of Wilson, Yu, Friedl and Norton.

Conclusion

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER


Michael G. Raucci
Registration No. 61,444

Date: February 1, 2008